1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3 4	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 04-521C Plaintiff, 04-643M
5	776
6	HERBERT CHADLER SANFORD,
7	Defendant. Defendant. Defendant.
8	
9	VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10	OF
11	A HEARING
12	
13	BEFORE THE KONORABLE MONICA J. BENTON, MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14	December 14, 2004
1 5	APPEARANCES
16	For Plaintiff United States: Carl Blackstone
17	For Defendant Sanford: Catherine Chaney
18	Also Present: Sara Moore, USPTS
19	
20	I INDIAN MAND MAND MAND
21	04-CR-00521-TN
22	Transcribed from CD recording using word processing equipment
23	
24	
25	Transcribed by Brian Killgore

(Proceedings of 12/14/2004)

THE CLERK: All rise, the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington is now in session, the Honorable Monica J. Benton presiding.

THE COURT: Good morning, please be seated.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: Your Honor, the case that's here before you is here for a detention review hearing in Cause Number CR 04-521C, United States v. Herbert C. Sanford. Will counsel please make appearances for the record?

MR. BLACKSTONE: Good morning, your Honor, Carl Blackstone for the United States. With me is FBI Agent Fred Good (phonetic).

THE COURT: Thank you, good morning.

MS. CHANEY: Good morning, your Honor, Catherine Chaney on behalf of Mr. Sanford. He is present.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaney, Mr. Sanford, good morning.

Let me first inquire of the government's position on the question of reopening this hearing and specifically the recommendation of the defense.

MR. BLACKSTONE: Your Honor, we think it's appropriate to reopen the hearing. Ms. Chaney has presented some new evidence to the Court, but we don't think it warrants changing the Court's detention order. We think the defendant should still be detained and I'll address the argument when it's appropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

All right, with that, then, Ms. Chaney, do you wish to make argument in support of your motion?

MS. CHANEY: Yes, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

1.

MS. CHANEY: Your Honor, present today in court are various members of Mr. Sanford's family, and also friends. Cheryl Wright, his wife, is present. His friend Valerie Najaro and actually Cheryl's sister. A friend Derek Goodrich. A friend Jamilia Adams, and that also the Wesleys, Candice and Preston Wesley, and their -- the couple who are offering Mr. Sanford a place to live in their home if he is released on conditions.

THE COURT: Where are the Wesleys? Very well.

MS. CHANEY: Your Honor, I did have an opportunity to review the new information in the Pretrial Services' report, and go over the proposed release conditions with Mr. Sanford this morning. He has no objection to any of those release conditions.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CHANEY: So we would ask the Court to release him on those conditions. I think the presumption is certainly for release, not for detention. He does have criminal history; however, I would point out that none of that suggests that he's ever been a risk in the past, or that he's failed to appear for court in the past.

He has strong family ties here. His three children are here.

The mother of two of his children couldn't be here this morning, 1 Deborah Robinson, but she did write a letter to your Honor, 2 indicating that Mr. Sanford has been much more involved in the 3 lives of his children recently, and many of his other ties to 4 the community and his efforts to create a new life for himself 5 are verified in the other letters presented to the Court. 6 7 THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. MS. CHANEY: Sure. 8 THE COURT: The residence address is a Tacoma address; is 9 that correct? 10 11 MS. CHANEY: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And his work is in Seattle or Fife? Where is 12 13 it? MS. CHANEY: No, "Michael Floyd" is I believe in Fife. 14 DEFENDANT SANFORD: No, Lakewood. Tacoma. 15 16 MS. CHANEY: Oh, Lynnwood. 17 DEFENDANT SANFORD: Tacoma. 18 MS. CHANEY: Tacoma. 19 THE COURT: All right, let's see what's verified. You have 20 filed documents with the Court, Ms. Chaney; do you list the address at all? 21 22 MS. CHANEY: Uhm --23 THE COURT: Is he to return to work with --24 MS. CHANEY: Your Honor --THE COURT: -- & Cut 'n up&? 25

MS. CHANEY: Your Honor, I have that address.

THE COURT: What is it?

MS. CHANEY: In Lakewood. 9808 59th Ave SW, Lakewood, Washington.

THE COURT: All right, and that is the name of which?

MS. CHANEY: "A Cut Above."

THE COURT: "A Cut Above?" And that's different from "Cut

?ייקָּטָ ארֹ

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHANEY: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. MOORE: He had worked, your Honor -- to clarify, he had worked at "A Cut Above" in the past, but more recently he had worked at "Cut 'N Up." However, since it would be closer to where he'll be living, if released with the Wesleys, he would prefer to work at Mr. Floyd's shop.

THE COURT: All right, it is listed on page 3 of your report. All right.

MS. CHANEY: And, your Honor, the other thing that I would point out based on the current charges in the indictment and the complaint, even given his criminal history, given the loss amounts, which the government has currently alleged, he would only be looking at approximately a year if he were convicted.

So the length of the potential sentence I think isn't so great that he would risk everything that he would lose if he were to attempt to evade this court or flee. He certainly does

not intend to do so, and so we would ask the Court to release him on all of the conditions.

THE COURT: All right. The type of work that he would be doing would put him in contact with other people's debit cards, cash cards, that sort of thing; the family is shaking their head no, but how does -- how is money handled at this barbershop?

MR. WESLEY: It's all cash.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wesley. I need something verified.

Do you know, Ms. Moore?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MOORE: No, your Honor, I do not know.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Chaney?

MS. CHANEY: I don't know, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to make sure I ask --

MS. CHANEY: I mean if the Court --

THE COURT: -- the right questions.

MS. CHANEY: -- wanted to put a condition on it --

THE COURT: I think I would.

MS. CHANEY: -- that any -- other than cash, any payment would have to go through the owner or through another person at the shop, and that he would only be allowed to deal in cash. We would have no objection to that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WESLEY: I was employed as a barber there myself, so I know how they receive money.

MS. CHANEY: Mr. Wesley -- to his knowledge, they're not -- they can't take debit cards, but we don't have any objection to that if the Court wants it added.

THE COURT: All right, anything further?

MS. CHANEY: No, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Mr. Blackstone?

MR. BLACKSTONE: Thank you, your Honor. The Court entered a detention order recently in which you found the defendant was not a good candidate for release because of his lack of a stable residence, his unverified background, his use of aliases, different social security numbers, and his extensive criminal history.

We don't believe this new information provided by the defense overcomes the Court's prior findings.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. BLACKSTONE: First she's submitted two new pieces of information for you: One is the Wesleys will take in the defendant now.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. BLACKSTONE: And my only question there is how come he's not living with his wife? I don't understand that. Where is his wife living and how come he's not residing with his wife? Why is he going to live with the Wesleys? I don't know the answer to that.

USA v. Herbert Chadler Sanford - CR 04-521C - (12/14/2004) - P. 8

As to his employment, he has not worked for Mr. Floyd for some time, so this is not a new and stable place of employment. It's a new place of employment. I'm not confident what he's going to be doing there. He's going to be working on a commission basis.

But even if the Court finds that information is satisfactory,

I think there's a lot of problems in releasing this defendant.

First as to flight risk, we think he is a risk of flight.

And one thing I know the Court looks at is whether they can trust the defendant when they release him, because a lot of the system is based on trust: When he gives you his word he'll show up; can you believe him?

We already know he's lied to this court and to Pretrial Services. When he was first interviewed he told Pretrial that he was living at a residence in Kent with a woman named Tracy Spencer. We all know that's not true.

Tracy Spencer has been interviewed and she said that he was not living with her -- he was not living with her at the time of his arrest in November.

The FBI has talked to Ms. Spencer and she said that he would spend a couple of days a week there at her apartment, on and off for the last year, but when he was interviewed by Ms. Moore, and she prepared a report, he said he was living with Tracy Spencer. That's not true.

We don't know where he's been living for the last couple of

USA v. Herbert Chadler Sanford - CR 04-521C - (12/14/2004) - P. 9

weeks before he got arrested. We don't know anything about Ms. Wesley.

So I think the Court should look at his truthfulness; if he's lying to the Court about where he lived, there's something going on there.

When he was arrested on November 18, he tried to flee from the FBI agent. He tried to discard his keys to his Cadillac and a couple of cell phones. And he did that for good reason, because inside his Cadillac the FBI found a lot of incriminating information. They found identification documents for about 50 people. These are real live people. He had their driver's license photograph -- he had credit applications for them, banking information for them, and insurance information for them.

All the things you need to make a false ID to assume someone else's identification.

He also had a laptop computer in his car -- the tools of the trade. Something that could be used to make a fake ID. And on that laptop the FBI did find some evidence that he was making false identifications -- not for him, but possibly for other people.

Additionally, he had a check in his possession when he was arrested; it came back to Ms. Spencer's payroll checks. She worked for a company called Nurse Link, and he had a copy of her check in his possession with the payee name blacked out. That

check was used in this bank fraud scheme by another defendant.

THE COURT: Who is Ms. Spencer?

MR. BLACKSTONE: Ms. Spencer was his girlfriend, the woman he was living with in Kent, right prior to his arrest.

THE COURT: All right.

б

MR. BLACKSTONE: So we think that the fact that he fled at the time of his arrest, the fact that he has the ability to make false IDs -- the Court has already found he's used different names in the past and different Social Security numbers. He's got all the tools of the trade to enable him to flee.

And contrary to what Ms. Chaney says, he is looking at a lot more time in federal prison. Right now we're working on the loss figure, but the FBI can prove at least \$300,000 from this scheme, and I anticipate it's going to go as high as \$500,000.

If it's at half a million dollars, he's looking at eight to 10 years in federal prison, given his criminal history, so it's not one year or two years, like Ms. Chaney said. He's looking at more time than he's ever faced before in federal prison. And as the Court knows, we don't have parole anymore, so when you get a 10-year sentence, you serve essentially all of that.

So the complexion of this case has changed and the incentive to flee I think goes way up given that -- the amount of time he's looking at.

Additionally, we're concerned also with the issue of danger. His criminal history is uninterrupted from 1987 to the present.

That's 17 years. He's suffered conviction after conviction, culminating in a 1998 conviction for drugs, in which he was sentenced to 67 months in prison. He has a forgery conviction, a credit card fraud conviction, all the same things he's accused of doing now, so I think this criminal history militates in favor of a danger to the community.

Additionally, in our complaint that was signed by this court, a witness said that she had been to Mr. Sanford's apartment back in May or June of this year, and while there, he was taking her photograph for use in a fake ID. She saw three handguns in his residence.

Those guns are still unaccounted for, so we're concerned about those guns that are sitting out there.

THE COURT: They're found in his home?

MR. BLACKSTONE: In the apartment he was sharing with Ms. Spencer.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BLACKSTONE: And Ms. Spencer has said she never saw guns in her apartment. That's what she has told the FBI. But the witness who was interviewed by the FBI said she saw three guns there, and she was down there with Mr. Sanford taking her picture for use -- to make a fake ID with.

I think that's all I have, thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

You trigger my recollection of the first hearing with your

recitation of the case and the case investigation.

Any response, Ms. Chaney?

1.1

MS. CHANEY: Yes, your Honor.

Regarding the allegation of the use of different names and Social Security numbers, I believe that that information came from the NCIC, which is not necessarily verified, and I don't know what that's based on, but there's certainly nothing -- there are no facts in the complaint to suggest that that is true, and sometimes information on those NCICs can be extremely unreliable, in my experience, anyway.

Mr. Blackstone suggested that he didn't know who Mrs. Wesley is; Mrs. Wesley is a very long-term friend and ex-girlfriend of Mr. Sanford, and the mother of his oldest son. She is a fixture in this community, as is her husband, and they've offered a stable residence for Mr. Sanford to stay in. They trust him and love him and they don't have any problem with him staying at their house.

You know, in terms of the loss amount, I don't know; all I know is that the information -- the only information that the government has given me suggests a much, much lower number, and so we'll see whether or not in fact it's the case that there is actually a higher number.

In terms of the complaining witness mentioned by Mr.

Blackstone, I think it's interesting that he also indicated that

Ms. Spencer, who was living in that apartment, said that she

USA v. Herbert Chadler Sanford - CR 04-521C - (12/14/2004) - P. 13

never saw Mr. Sanford with a gun, or never saw any guns in that apartment.

That witness is a cooperating witness and I believe that the Court should view her information with caution, just as a jury would be instructed at trial to view any information from a cooperating witness who is benefiting by giving testimony to the government, with extreme caution.

There is no other information that Mr. Sanford has ever been in possession of a firearm, and indeed he's well aware that as a felon he can't have a firearm or be anywhere near firearms.

The Wesleys would have -- certainly wouldn't take him in if they thought that he was attempting to use a weapon or have access to a weapon.

Your Honor, there certainly are conditions -- and again, his criminal history -- you know, we acknowledge he certainly does have criminal history, but he's been making an effort to go straight, and he doesn't have warrants on his criminal history, which is significant.

THE COURT: Do you have an answer or explanation for his failure to be candid with Pretrial Services about his residence when he was interviewed?

MS. CHANEY: Your Honor, he had been living there off and on, and he thought that he was still living there, is my understanding.

THE COURT: All right. You know, my experience tells me

which Ms. Spencer provides are not stable, because of the pattern of this off and on residence business. I mean this is a grown man who can conduct his business any way he wishes, as long as somebody is willing to stand up and say he lives here.

And I'm really -- I think there's a pattern there. I really think -- I mean his wife doesn't want him there, or you don't think she's --

MS. CHANEY: It's not -- your Honor, they're separated.

THE COURT: -- stable.

MS. WRIGHT: That's not true at all.

THE COURT: Well don't respond out loud. Raise your hand and wait till you're recognized. All right.

Go ahead, Ms. Chaney.

MS. CHANEY: Your Honor, they are separated, and that's why -- and they don't have an intention to -- they are in the process of divorce, I believe --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CHANEY: -- and so that's what's going on with that, but she certainly supports him and has -- you know, they are good friends and they'll stay friends.

THE COURT: All right. All right. She wants to be recognized by the Court, so have her come forward, please.

Mr. Blackstone, I have a question for you, after she finishes, and it has to do with the specificity of the witness's

description of the firearms when she saw them.

MS. WRIGHT: Hello, my name is Cheryl Wright. In regards to our separation, we have been separated for a little over a year. The reason for our separation is because of Ms. Spencer. It's because at the time he was, you know, cheating on -- having an affair with me -- with Ms. Spencer. He was staying there. I went there on several occasions, so whatever she is saying to these officers is like totally untrue.

I know at the time when he was arrested, they had departed, and he was staying just like with various friends, or just staying around because he didn't have the money to get his own place.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

ı

б

MS. WRIGHT: But he -- he was, you know, staying with her for the last year. I witnessed that because I went there -- you know, because I found her address, and that's how I figured that he was staying with her, and her residence is not far from mine.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MS. WRIGHT: And so as far as, you know, what she's telling the Court, I don't know why she would say that -- probably because she's angry because of their separation, but they have been seeing each other for like well over a year.

And as far as him not coming to my home, he's more than welcome to come to my home, even though -- you know, I'm the one that puts the past behind me, you know, so what he did in the

past, as far as Ms. Spencer, that's something that he has to deal with, you know?

And if the Court wants him to come to my house, he's more than welcome, but his son wanted him to stay with him, and that's the reason why -- one reason why Ms. Wesley opened her home to him.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Wesley, you want to be recognized, as well? Step forward.

Thank you, Ms. Chaney.

MS. WESLEY: Hello, my name is Candice Wesley, and in regards to him saying he doesn't know anything about the Wesleys, he's right, he doesn't know anything about the Wesleys.

Also in regards to Ms. Spencer, I've spoken with her since all of this has been going on, on several occasions -- actually, as recent as last night, and she has shared with me that she was scared and that she was afraid, and my question to her is when someone's life is on the line, why would you lie? Because in between their disagreements and their arguing, my husband and I have provided a safe haven for him, so that he didn't sleep in the car, and so that he didn't have to bum money from other people to have a place to lay his head, and so I do have some concerns in regards to her credibility, as far as her telling the truth, in regards to where he resided -- as far as I know, he stayed there. She's been to my home on several occasions

with him. She has also called my home when they weren't -- I knew that they were not together when he was arrested because she had called me to see if he was sleeping at my house, because he always comes to be with his son.

And so that's how I knew that they were not getting along.

THE COURT: What you're telling me --

MS. WESLEY: So she shocked me when she told me that she told them that he didn't live with her.

THE COURT: Well you just said they weren't together.

MS. WESLEY: Right, but they are making it seem like he never was with her. I can see him not being with her for three or four months and never living there; it's one thing when you get in an argument, pack your stuff up and leave, but he lived with her.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WESLEY: And so I don't know why she's not telling the truth. That's something they would have to take up with her.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WESLEY: And that's what I have to say.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Ms. Wesley.

Mr. Blackstone?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. BLACKSTONE: I think what I said, your Honor, was he's lived there on and off for the past year, but at the time of the arrest, they had broken up and he was no longer residing there, so I don't mean to mislead the Court --

THE COURT: I think that's consistent with what Ms. Wesley is saying. Go ahead,

MR. BLACKSTONE: One thing I wanted to share with the Court, the agent just provided me with a series of business cards that were taken from Mr. Sanford's Cadillac, and they all have a fake name on it -- "Upper Cuts." A hair-cutting place with the name of Rafeek Sadeek (phonetic). This is an alias that the defendant has been known to use, so he's got business cards with a name other than his own.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. BLACKSTONE: I think it confirms what the NCIC pointed out by way of aliases.

In terms of the guns, your Honor, I'm referring to paragraph 68 of the complaint, which this court signed I think on November 17. The witness's name is Kareema Yaku (phonetic), and in this paragraph she says she went down to Mr. Sanford's apartment to have her picture taken, and she reports that while in the apartment to have her picture taken, she observed three handguns in the apartment in addition to those that the other defendants had. So that's the best I can do in terms of giving you a description. They were handguns.

THE COURT: Is she a cooperating witness as Ms. Chaney has characterized her?

MR. BLACKSTONE: She is, but she's -- she has cooperated with the government. We've offered her nothing for her

cooperation. She is currently in custody in Phoenix. She was arrested on trying to pass some counterfeit checks.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. BLACKSTONE: So we've not given her immunity or told her she won't be charged.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. BLACKSTONE: She has cooperated with us and told us what happened, but there have been no promises made to her in exchange for her testimony.

THE COURT: All right.

You know, I think that my experience and instinct in this case is right about Mr. Sanford.

I think the lack of stable residence, the lack of crime free background, and/or even recent crime free background, the presence of other people's identifications in his car, the attempt to flee and discard his association with the car, the keys, etc. -- I think that I'm right about detaining Mr. Sanford, and I'm going to detain him.

So I would not remove the order. He'll continue to be in custody. Very well, thank you.

MR. BLACKSTONE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE CLERK: All rise, the Court is in recess.

(End of Proceedings for 12/14/2004)

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

25

CERTIFICATE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I, Brian Killgore, do hereby certify:

That ACE Reporting Services, Inc., is a court-approved transcription company for the state of Washington, counties of King and Cowlitz, and for the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington;

That the annexed and foregoing transcript of electronically recorded proceedings was transcribed by me to the best of my ability;

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties to said action, or a relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or outcome thereof;

I further certify that the transcript is a true and correct record of all audible portions of the taped testimony, including questions and answers, and all objections, motions and exceptions of counsel made at the time of the foregoing proceedings. Areas of the tape(s) or CD(s) that were not decipherable for any reason are noted as [INAUDIBLE].

Dated this 31st day of December 2004.

Brian J. Killgore ACE Reporting Services, Inc. 1900 West Nickerson Street Suite 209 Seattle, WA 98119-1650 (206) 467-6188

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

My commission expires 11/1/2008



23

24

25